

REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 16, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, the Specification claims 6 and 11 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 6 can be found on at least page 8, lines 13-18 of the Specification, original claim 2 and Fig. 3. Support for the amendments to the Specification can be found in claim 2 of the application as originally filed.

With respect to the amendments to claim 6, the Applicants respectfully submit that in Fig. 3 and the description in line 14 on page 8, discloses that the comparison of the masses between the main frame and the sub-frame of $1/10 - 1/3$ is performed with respect to the whole mass since it is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that any comparison between the main frame and the sub-frame would be with respect to the same unit of measurement, the whole mass of both elements, and that the resulting ratio would be based on that unit of measurement. Thus, the description on page 8, line 13, "the weight of the sub-frame including mounted members" should be read as "the whole mass of the sub-frame including mounted members". No new matter has been added. Claims 6-11 are pending and respectfully submitted for consideration.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6. The Office Action took the position that the Specification did not provide a description of what

"mounted members" are provided on the sub-frame. Responsive to the rejection, the Applicants have deleted the recitation of "mounted members" from claim 6.

It should be noted that the present invention includes the case where the sub-frame has a mass thereon, such as mounted members and the case where the sub-frame does not have mass thereon, such as mounted members. Specifically, in the present invention the mass of the sub-frame is $1/10 - 1/3$ of the mass of the main frame. In other words, the mass of the sub-frame = (mass of the sub-frame itself) + (mass of members mounted on the sub-frame, if any). In order to clarify this feature of the invention, the Applicants have amended claim 6 to recite "whole mass of the sub-frame" and have removed the limitation of "mounted members". As the Applicants have clarified claim 6, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is no longer indefinite and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 6-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action took the position that it was unclear what encompasses the total weight(s) of the sub-frame and main frame. In addition, the Office Action took the position that claim 6, as previously amended, was misdescriptive. See page 3, line 11 of the Office Action. Responsive to the rejection, the Applicants have amended claim 6 to remove the "mounted members" limitation.

In order to further clarify the claimed features of the invention, the Applicants submit that Fig. 3 illustrates that the claimed mass ratio of the whole mass of the sub-frame, being $1/10 - 1/3$ of the whole mass of the main frame, represents the relationship

between the mass of the main frame and the mass of the sub-frame, in which the elastic members lie between the block of the main frame and the block of the sub-frame. Thus, each frame independently moves with respect to the other. Specifically, it would be readily understood from Fig. 3 that the whole mass of the sub-frame, which exists above the main frame through the elastic members and may include a mounted members, is naturally omitted when considering the mass of the main frame. More specifically, the effect of the present invention (i.e., vibration suppressing effect) can be obtained by the configuration as shown in Fig. 3, wherein the sub-frame exists above the main frame with the elastic members therebetween.

As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, clearly recites the whole mass of the sub-frame with respect to the main frame. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

Claims 7-11 depend from claim 6. The Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependency from allowable base claim 6. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections, allowance of claims 6-11, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 107156-00205.**

Respectfully submitted,



Rhonda L. Barton
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,271

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX PLLC

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036-5339

Tel: (202) 857-6000

Fax: (202) 638-4810

RLB/elz/wbp

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time (two months)